

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EDWARD THOMAS KENNEDY,)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:19-cv-0067
Plaintiff)	
)	(MANNION, D.J.)
v.)	
)	(ARBUCKLE, M.J.)
MARIA CASEY, <i>et al.</i>)	
Defendants)	

ORDER

On January 11, 2019, Plaintiff lodged a complaint (Doc. 1) and filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis* (Doc. 2). Along with the complaint and motion, the plaintiff filed a Motion for Authorization to File Electronically (Doc. 3). The Motion to File Electronically was denied by Order (Doc. 6) because Court permission is not required to register as an ECF user. The Motion for Leave to Proceed IFP is under review as a part of the mandatory screening provisions in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). *See Atamian v. Burns*, 236 F. App'x 753, 755 (3d Cir. 2007) (“the screening procedures set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) apply to *in forma pauperis* complaints filed by prisoners and non-prisoners alike.”).

Before the Court is the Plaintiff’s First Motion to Compel Service (Doc. 8). That motion is premature as the case is currently only “lodged” and will not be deemed “filed” until the IFP screening process is complete. The requested relief will be granted if the case is screened and IFP is granted. It is possible that the screening will result in a recommendation that the complaint be amended. If that

recommendation is forthcoming the complaint will not be served until the amended complaint is filed. However either result must wait the outcome of the initial screening process.

Therefore, the First Motion to Compel Service (Doc. 8) is **denied**.

Date: January 28, 2019

BY THE COURT

s/William I. Arbuckle
William I. Arbuckle
U. S. Magistrate Judge